

has refused to testify about nonprivileged material. He is in contempt.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank my colleague from Wyoming for supporting this effort of the committee. She has been a wonderful member of the committee, and I look forward to continuing the relationship.

I thank my colleagues who presented on the majority side today who made a clear case of why Mr. Meadows' defiance is unacceptable.

I take no joy in having to ask this House to make this referral. Mr. Meadows served here with us for 7 years, but that doesn't excuse his conduct. If anything, he should know better.

It is disappointing that he put himself in this category with a small handful of uncooperative witnesses who are drawing out a lot of attention hiding behind every privilege you can think of trying to slow down and slow-walk this process. We want to hear from them all.

But we have heard from more than 300 witnesses. Just this week, three significant individuals have already come in and spoken with us on the record. As you have heard, last night and today, we have made some significant findings. This investigation is moving ahead swiftly, but even with all that cooperation, we need to send a clear message that this sort of defiance of the rule of law cannot stand.

We need to hear from Mr. Meadows, and his refusal to appear is plain and simple contempt.

I ask all Members to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint Resolution relating to increasing the debt limit.

COMBATING INTERNATIONAL ISLAMOPHOBIA ACT

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 849, I call up

the bill (H.R. 5665) to establish in the Department of State the Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida). Pursuant to House Resolution 849, in lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-23, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 117-218, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Combating International Islamophobia Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT ISLAMOPHOBIA.

Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 64. MONITORING AND COMBATING ISLAMOPHOBIA.

"(a) OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT ISLAMOPHOBIA.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish within the Department of State an Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia (in this section referred to as the 'Office').

"(2) HEAD OF OFFICE.—

"(A) SPECIAL ENVOY FOR MONITORING AND COMBATING ISLAMOPHOBIA.—The head of the Office shall be the Special Envoy for Monitoring and Combating Islamophobia (in this section referred to as the 'Special Envoy').

"(B) APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint the Special Envoy. If the President determines that such is appropriate, the President may appoint the Special Envoy from among officers and employees of the Department of State. The Secretary of State may allow such officer or employee to retain the position (and the responsibilities associated with such position) held by such officer or employee prior to such appointment.

"(b) PURPOSE OF OFFICE.—Upon establishment, the Office shall assume primary responsibility for the following:

"(1) Monitoring and combating acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement that occur in foreign countries.

"(2) Coordinating and assisting in the preparation of that portion of the reports required by paragraph (9) of section 116(d) and subsection (k) of section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304) relating to an assessment and description of the nature and extent of acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement.

"(3) Coordinating and assisting in the preparation of that portion of the report required by clause (viii) of section 102(b)(1)(A) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)(1)(A)) relating to an assessment and description of the nature and extent of acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement.

"(c) CONSULTATIONS.—The Special Envoy shall consult with domestic and inter-

national nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations and institutions, as the Special Envoy considers appropriate, to carry out this section."

SEC. 3. INCLUSION IN DEPARTMENT OF STATE ANNUAL REPORTS OF INFORMATION CONCERNING ACTS OF ISLAMOPHOBIA IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.—The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 116(d) (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d))—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), (11), and (12), as paragraphs (10), (11), (12), and (13), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) wherever applicable, a description of the nature and extent of acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement that occur during the preceding year, including descriptions of—

"(A) acts of physical violence against, or harassment of, Muslim people, and acts of violence against, or vandalism of, Muslim community institutions, including schools, mosques, and cemeteries;

"(B) instances of propaganda in government and nongovernment media that attempt to justify or promote racial hatred or incite acts of violence against Muslim people;

"(C) the actions, if any, taken by the government of the country to respond to such violence and attacks or to eliminate such propaganda or incitement;

"(D) the actions taken by such government to enact and enforce laws relating to the protection of the right to religious freedom of Muslim people;

"(E) the efforts of such government to promote anti-bias and tolerance education; and

"(F) any instances of forced labor, reeducation, or the presence of concentration camps, such as those targeting the Uyghurs in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China;" and

(2) in section 502B (22 U.S.C. 2304), by—

(A) redesignating the second subsection (i) (relating to child marriage status) as subsection (j); and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) INFORMATION CONCERNING ACTS OF ISLAMOPHOBIA IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—The report required by subsection (b) shall include, wherever applicable, a description of the nature and extent of acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement that occur during the preceding year, including descriptions of—

"(1) acts of physical violence against, or harassment of, Muslim people, and acts of violence against, or vandalism of, Muslim community institutions, including schools, mosques, and cemeteries;

"(2) instances of propaganda in government and nongovernment media that attempt to justify or promote racial hatred or incite acts of violence against Muslim people;

"(3) the actions, if any, taken by the government of the country to respond to such violence and attacks or to eliminate such propaganda or incitement;

"(4) the actions taken by such government to enact and enforce laws relating to the protection of the right to religious freedom of Muslim people;

"(5) the efforts of such government to promote anti-bias and tolerance education; and

"(6) any instances of forced labor, reeducation, or the presence of concentration camps, such as those targeting the Uyghurs in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China."

(b) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.—Section 102(b)(1)(A) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vi), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (vii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(viii) wherever applicable, an assessment and description of the nature and extent of acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement that occur in that country during the preceding year, including—

“(I) acts of physical violence against, or harassment of, Muslim people, acts of violence against, or vandalism of, Muslim community institutions, instances of propaganda in government and nongovernment media that incite such acts, and statements and actions relating thereto;

“(II) the actions taken by the government of that country to respond to such violence and attacks or to eliminate such propaganda or incitement, to enact and enforce laws relating to the protection of the right to religious freedom of Muslims, and to promote anti-bias and tolerance education; and

“(III) any instances of forced labor, reeducation, or the presence of concentration camps, such as those targeting the Uyghurs in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF INCLUSIONS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply beginning with the first reports required under sections 116(d) and 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n and 2304) and section 102(b)(1)(A) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6312(b)(1)(A)) that are submitted after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION.

No funds made available pursuant to this Act or an amendment made by this Act may be used to promote or endorse a Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement ideology or used to promote or endorse a Muslim ban, such as the one instituted by former President Trump.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 5665.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5665, the Combating International Islamophobia Act.

Before I continue, let me insert in the RECORD a Statement of Adminis-

tration Policy, which begins by stating: “The administration supports passage of H.R. 5665, the Combating International Islamophobia Act.” And “Our country’s commitment to defending freedom of religion and belief goes back centuries, and the administration strongly believes that people of all faiths and backgrounds should be treated with equal dignity and respect around the world.”

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5665—COMBATTING INTERNATIONAL ISLAMOPHOBIA ACT—REP. OMAR, D-MN, AND 56 CO-SPONSORS

The Administration supports passage of H.R. 5665, the Combating International Islamophobia Act. Religious freedom is a fundamental human right. This freedom is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is also part of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Our country’s commitment to defending freedom of religion and belief goes back centuries, and the Administration strongly believes that people of all faiths and backgrounds should be treated with equal dignity and respect around the world.

The Administration also supports language in H.R. 5665 that calls attention to instances of forced labor, reeducation, or the presence of concentration camps, such as those targeting Uyghur and other minorities in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China.

The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to ensure the Secretary of State has the necessary flexibility and permissive authority to designate such an office and special envoy and to provide for an annual report monitoring concerning acts of Islamophobia in foreign countries.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I could not agree more. The world is seeing an alarming rise in anti-Muslim sentiment and violence, and we are witnessing those same trends, unfortunately, here in the United States of America.

In recent years, anti-Muslim bigotry has been on the rise with mosques being vandalized and Muslims beaten and attacked and elected officials on the receiving end of death threats and other hateful rhetoric all due to their Muslim faith.

Bigotry is unacceptable, and it is incumbent on all of us to condemn it wherever and whenever it occurs.

□ 1815

The great Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.” Not only must we address anti-Muslim bigotry here in the United States, but we are also obligated to confront that bigotry wherever and whenever we see it happening around the world.

In 2019, New Zealand witnessed the worst terrorist attack in that nation’s history when a white supremacist gunman killed 51 Muslim worshippers and injured 40 others at two mosques.

Just last week, here on the House floor, we discussed the horrific atrocities being committed against Uyghur Muslims in China and the Rohingya Muslims in Burma. We did it in a bipartisan way with my good friend and col-

league Mr. McCAUL. That is who we should be, and that is what we should represent because freedom of religion is a fundamental human right, and no one should be the target of discrimination because of their faith.

Prior to considering H.R. 5665, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held numerous hearings, including with Secretary of State Anthony Blinken, U.N. Ambassador Linda Thomas-Greenfield, and leading academics across the country that discussed and better informed our understanding of anti-Muslim bigotry and Islamophobia.

With the passage of H.R. 5665, the establishment of an office at the State Department to help combat the scourge of Islamophobia, we take an important step toward addressing this problem. That is why I am proud to support the Combating International Islamophobia Act. This important legislation would do three very, very important but simple things. First, it would establish an office to monitor and combat Islamophobia at the State Department. Second, it would provide the authority to the executive branch to appoint a special envoy for monitoring and combating Islamophobia. And third, it will help to improve State Department reporting on threats to Muslims around the world.

Now, several of my colleagues on the other side have stated that they oppose this bill, that the bill does not define Islamophobia, but I believe, and I think they seem to have an awareness, as we all do, for Islamophobia when they criticize the bill for not doing enough to address Islamophobia against the Uyghur population in China.

Madam Speaker, discrimination and bigotry are abhorrent, and combating them is something which we should all be able to do together. That is why I am so heartened to see this important piece of legislation being led by a Muslim Member of Congress and a Jewish Member of Congress. I wish I could say by a Democratic Member of Congress and a Republican Member of Congress. That would be the right message to send to the world.

Discrimination and bigotry bring out the worst in humanity. I know that my friend and colleague feels the same way. I know he does, as do many of my colleagues on the other side. But we have to stand up and say it right here on the floor so the world knows what we stand for. If left unchecked, they can lead to terrible atrocities, to crimes against humanity, and even to genocide. So this legislation will help shine a light on this problem and help address the global rise of Islamophobia at a time in which Islamophobia remains rampant.

Madam Speaker, I strongly encourage all Members of this House to support this very timely and important bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me just say to my good friend, Chairman MEEKS, we all deplore anti-Muslim persecution. No one should ever be attacked or denied their human rights or dignity because of their faith. So, we actually agree on the intent and the spirit behind this. But I do have some concerns with the wording in many parts of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, the United States Government is rightly committed to opposing these monstrous acts of violence that we have seen directed at Muslims around the world. This includes the horrific mosque shootings in Switzerland, Quebec, and Christchurch.

Our commitment must also apply to anti-Muslim persecution by foreign regimes, especially when it amounts to genocide. I am proud of our bipartisan work to condemn and punish the Burmese military's genocide against the Rohingya Muslims that began in 2016.

We are also working in a bipartisan fashion to oppose the Chinese Communist Party's ongoing genocide against the Uyghur Muslims that we passed together in a bipartisan manner on this floor just the other day.

Today, more than 1 million Muslims and other ethnic and religious minorities are held in camps and exploited as slave labor. Muslim children are ripped from their mothers' arms to be raised by the Communist Party. Muslim women are suffering systematic sexual violence, forced sterilization, and forced abortion.

Members on our side are fully committed to combating these anti-Muslim atrocities. I am proud of the work, again, that Chairman MEEKS and I were able to do together to hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable for their genocide, and I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

In addition, I am pleased that right after this bill, Chairman MCGOVERN, who has worked so hard with this committee, and Senator MARCO RUBIO in the Senate will finally be able to send to the President's desk a bipartisan, bicameral bill to combat the forced labor that supports the CCP's Uyghur genocide.

Unfortunately, the rushed, partisan bill before us today does not live up to these two serious bipartisan efforts. Committee Democrats made no effort to work toward a bipartisan agreement before the markup, and the bill has no Republican cosponsors.

This legislation is dangerously vague and unnecessarily duplicative. It doesn't frame things in terms of anti-Muslim persecution, nor does it use the typical statutory language like "gross violations of internationally recognized human rights."

Instead, it uses the undefined, nonlegal term of "Islamophobia." This word appears nowhere in the Federal statutes. It is so vague and subjective that it could be used against legitimate speech for partisan purposes. Even the term "phobia" connotes irrational fear, not discrimination.

The bill also completely ignores the State Department's extensive efforts already underway to protect the rights of Muslims. Regular monitoring and reporting are already carried out by human rights officers or embassies worldwide, as well as the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor; the Office of International Religious Freedom; and the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.

The annual "Country Reports" on human rights contain detailed, country-specific narratives of human rights violations targeting Muslims. The "Annual Report on International Religious Freedom" details anti-Muslim abuses and U.S. Government policy to address such challenges.

In addition, the current nominee to serve as the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, Rashad Hussain, is a prominent Muslim American.

Madam Speaker, the lack of a special envoy is not a sign of bigotry. In fact, there is no special envoy for the hundreds of millions of Christians who face dangerous persecution today. Also, there is no special envoy for the Hindus or the Buddhists or the Baha'is or the Yazidis or many other people of faith who experience persecution.

We have heard a lot from the other side about the office and special envoy on anti-Semitism, and I imagine that we will continue to hear about this during this debate. But while the wording of today's bill is modeled after the two prior anti-Semitism bills, the process has been completely different and inadequate.

Both bills, in 2004 and 2020, came after dedicated hearings showing the need for specialized legislation. The second bill is based on 16 years of experience before a Senate-confirmed special envoy was added.

In stark contrast, today's bill is the result of a hurried, partisan push over the last 6 days. This legislation was introduced less than 2 months ago. We have not held any hearings focused on whether the new State Department bureaucracy is needed or useful to counter anti-Muslim hate.

Finally, today we received the oddest Statement of Administration Policy that I can ever recall, basically saying that while the administration supports passage of the bill, it would like for this bill to be rewritten. This State Department would like for this bill to be rewritten. Why aren't we consulting with the State Department to get this bill right before we throw it on the House floor and pass it with such haste?

In it, the administration also says that it wants to include language to "ensure the Secretary of State has the necessary flexibility and permissive authority to designate such an office and special envoy." In other words, the administration doesn't want to be required to create this office and position, as this bill mandates.

Combating religious persecution against all people of faith, including

Muslims, is a serious issue, and it deserves the kind of serious attention that draws bipartisan support. I also believe that a definition for clarity as to what Islamophobia is and how it would apply should be done through the legislative intent of the Congress and not left up to the bureaucracy in the State Department.

Unfortunately, the text has been rushed to the floor. It is vague and redundant, as I have said. For that reason, I do oppose it.

I am going to get, later, into some definitions of Islamophobia from various scholars and lawyerly articles that really bring out how vague this term is. We are not saying we are protecting against persecution of Muslims or international human rights for Muslims. It is Islamophobia that I think draws the most scrutiny to this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), the sponsor of this most timely bill.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise because we are in the midst of a staggering rise of anti-Muslim violence and discrimination around the world. At its worst, it is Uyghurs in concentration camps in China and genocide against the Rohingya in Burma. But those atrocities are part of a deeper fabric of violence against Muslims and impunity for violence against Muslims at a global level.

In India, Prime Minister Modi's government has moved to strip citizenship from millions of Muslims. In Sri Lanka, anti-Muslim laws and violence have imposed terror on the community. In Hungary, Belarus, and Poland, politicians have stoked fear of Muslim migrants and refugees. In New Zealand and Canada, white supremacist violence has targeted Muslims, including at their places of worship. And, of course, we in the United States are not immune to this hatred.

It is no secret that the previous President of the United States explicitly vowed "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States." But Trump was simply taking advantage of a deeper culture of Islamophobia that has existed for the past two decades, from the PATRIOT Act to the CVE program to Abu Ghraib.

□ 1830

None of these things are happening in isolation. We must understand that these problems are interlinked. In fact, earlier this year the United Nations commissioned a report and concluded that Islamophobia has reached "epidemic proportions," and urged nations around the world to take all necessary measures to combat it.

As a country that was founded on religious liberty, our leadership on international religious freedom depends on

recognizing that Islamophobia is global in scope and we must lead the global effort to address it. That is why Representative SCHAKOWSKY and I have introduced this bill, to create a special envoy for monitoring and combating Islamophobia at the State Department.

This bill also adds violence and incitement targeted at Muslims to the State Department's annual human rights report and international religious freedom report.

There are cynics who would rather see us divided on racial, ethnic, gender, and religious lines because it suits their political agenda. But I believe as Americans we should stand united against all forms of bigotry.

In fact, this legislation is modeled on the special envoy to combat anti-Semitism, and I was proud to cosponsor and vote last Congress on legislation to elevate that envoy to a cabinet-level position.

Because it is important, Madam Speaker, that we live in a world where everyone is free of persecution based on their religious background and beliefs. And until everyone is free to practice their religion, no one is.

I want to thank the colead of this bill, a partner in justice, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY, along with Chairman MEEKS, Speaker PELOSI, and the leadership team for their commitment to this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank the Council on American-Islamic Relations for their advocacy on this, and all the groups representing a cross-section of human rights, civil rights, and faith coalitions, who fight for religious rights for everyone around the world.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening in opposition to H.R. 5665.

All Americans can agree that persecution against any person or any group on the basis of religion is wrong. Religious tolerance is a fundamental value upon which this Nation was founded, which is why the free exercise of religion is protected in the very first amendment to our Constitution.

That same fundamental principle is why I persistently, in a bipartisan manner, supported the Rohingya Muslims who have been oppressed, victimized, and suffered genocide at the hands of the Burmese military. This principle also explains why the Ambassador At Large for International Religious Freedom and two other human rights offices at the State Department are already doing the work called for in this legislation.

However, the reasons to oppose this bill go beyond mere redundancy. It is also significantly flawed because Democrats have refused to include a definition of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement—the very subject matter the bill purports to address. In fact, Democrats voted down an amendment that I offered in com-

mittee to exclude legitimate criticism from what counts as Islamophobia.

As a result, this bill doesn't make it clear whether the term Islamophobia includes, for example, criticizing radical Islamic terrorist groups or calling out the persecution of Christians. Is it Islamophobic to oppose unacceptably intolerant blasphemy laws, or criticize those who call for the destruction of Israel?

What about criticizing the Taliban's brutal repression of women, or condemning those who deny the Holocaust, as Iran's Supreme Leader has repeatedly done?

While clearly, none of these criticisms should be considered Islamophobic, it is deeply concerning that this bill's supporters have refused to protect such legitimate free speech. Thus, this legislation could be used to label almost any criticism of Islam, including criticism of Sharia law as Islamophobic.

It is almost as if its goal is to shut down all debate and protect Islam from any criticism in polite society. Thus, we get to the core problem of this bill—it treats the persecution of Muslims as uniquely unacceptable. Let's face it, pretty much every religion faces persecution, as anyone who has studied history can attest.

Arguably, Christians endured global persecution equal to or worse than Muslims. Further, Hindus, the Falun Gong, the Baha'is, Tibetan Buddhists, even atheists all experience repression on some corner of the globe. While Muslims do face heinous genocides in China and Burma, Christians and Yazidis also faced genocide at the hands of the Islamic State not long ago.

Finally, this legislation ill-advisedly evaluates the persecution of Muslims to a special category similar to the legislation that created the special envoy to combat anti-Semitism. Unlike alleged Islamophobia, anti-Semitism is a truly unique problem. In the aftermath of the Holocaust, the world realized just how pernicious anti-Semitism was and has been for centuries, and rightly sought to eliminate it.

Putting Islamophobia in the same category as anti-Semitism dramatically understates, even trivializes the historic and pervasive nature that makes anti-Semitism such a difficult problem to overcome. Such a dangerous false equivalence might be used by extremists to justify further anti-Semitic activity.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, let me just reply to Mr. MCCAUL earlier that the anti-Semitism legislation was introduced on January 3 of 2019, passed the House on January 11 of 2019. There were no hearings that were held that last Congress before we passed the vote, and there was no markup, as we had in our committee this year at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms.

SCHAKOWSKY), the cosponsor of this legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise as a proud colead of the Combating International Islamophobia Act.

In the United States alone, nearly 70 percent of American Muslims have reported personally experiencing anti-Muslim hate, bigotry, and even violence. This anti-Muslim hate isn't just confined to certain communities and areas of this country. It has reached out in ugly ways, including in my own community, in my own district, to a member of my staff and her family.

My colleagues and friends in Congress know that Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR, the chief sponsor of this legislation, knows all about this in far too personal a way. She has been subjected to relentless attacks and horrifying threats, not just from her fellow Americans, but even within the Halls of Congress. Enough is enough.

This should not be a controversial bill. We have had a special envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism for years, and I proudly support that office's work. As a Jew myself, I see the parallel quite directly between anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, and we need to be combating both.

As a Nation that prides itself on defending human rights and standing up against hate and bigotry, creating a special envoy to monitor and combat Islamophobia makes perfect sense.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right, which is to vote 'yes' on the Combating International Islamophobia Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent south central Pennsylvania, where there is a large community of Ahmadiyya Muslims, the most persecuted—the most persecuted Muslims—in the Muslim faith, but yet there is nothing in this bill to safeguard them.

As a matter of fact, many of my colleagues have and will continue to speak about the lack of definition because it is going to be made up, ladies and gentlemen, it is just going to be made up based on your political proclivities. You are either going to be persecuted or you are not, depending on who you are and who you vote for.

Let's face it, aside from the attempts to placate an anti-Semitic Member of this Chamber, all that is really happening here is that House Democrats are deflecting from the real issue confronting the House of Representatives, and that is that the maker of this bill has no business sitting on House committees, has no business in this Chamber—a myriad of anti-Semitic comments and those of support of violence and terrorisms against the United States are wholly unacceptable. But we are not going to deal with that because we are going to deal with this.

Let's not forget the moment the author of this bill breathtakingly referred to the murder of nearly 3,000 Americans on 9/11 by Islamist terrorists as some people who did something—some people who did something.

During last week's markup of this legislation in the Foreign Affairs Committee, I was assailed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they told me I was Islamophobic, nasty, mean, and rude. Why?

Because I offered amendments that would have prevented American tax dollars from going to organizations with ties to terrorism. Ties to terrorism. You would think that that would be something we could agree on because we all agree that nobody should be persecuted based on their faith. We all agree on that.

But American taxpayers shouldn't be forced to pay terrorist organizations; organizations that the maker of this bill is affiliated with, like the one that is an unindicted co-conspirator in the largest terror finance case in the United States of America's history. Not because I say so, because the judge says so.

By intentionally leaving the definition of Islamophobia blank in this bill, the gentlelady and my friends on the other side of the aisle are creating an office in our State Department that will likely spew anti-Semitic hatred and attack Western ideas throughout the world under the farce of protecting Islam.

As you can see by this debate, the goal is to silence dissent and critics of terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, we want to take down the words. I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will take his seat.

(1945)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

You are either going to be persecuted or you are not, depending on who you are and who you vote for.

Let's face it, aside from the attempts to placate an anti-Semitic Member of this Chamber, all that is really happening here is House Democrats are deflecting from the real issue confronting the House of Representatives, and that is that the maker of this bill has no business sitting on House committees, has no business in this Chamber—a myriad of anti-Semitic comments and those of support of violence and terrorisms against the United States are wholly unacceptable. But we are not going to deal with that because we are going to deal with this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will further report the words.

The Clerk continued to read as follows:

But American taxpayers shouldn't be forced to pay terrorist organizations; organizations that the maker of this bill is affiliated with, like the one that is an unindicted co-conspirator in the largest terror finance

case in the United States of America's history. Not because I say so, because the judge says so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule. The words from the gentleman from Pennsylvania contain an allegation that the "maker of the bill" is affiliated with a terrorist organization. This remark impugns the patriotism or loyalty of a Member of the House, which is not in order as stated in section 370 of the House Rules and Manual. The gentleman from Pennsylvania also alleges that the "maker of the bill" is anti-Semitic. This remark constitutes an allegation of discrimination, which is not in order as stated in section 370 of the House Rules and Manual. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is the sponsor of this measure, H.R. 5665, as reflected in the official records of the House. Therefore, the Chair finds that the remarks constitute personalities directed toward an identifiable Member.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BIGGS. I have several inquiries, if I might. I am not trying to press. I am trying to understand.

The first one is did the Speaker and the Parliamentarian distinguish or identify by the term "author" of the bill, "maker" of the bill, or "sponsor" of the bill when making its ruling and determination in this case?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has addressed that in the ruling.

Does the gentleman have an additional inquiry?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, I do. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BIGGS. My question is regarding the determination that these words were nonparliamentary. What is the extent of the protection of the debate and speech clause, vis-a-vis, for instance, when we have had a resolution to strip a Member of committee, another resolution to strip a different Member of committee this year. And during the debate of that we had all kinds of aspersions and comments, and if these allegations, which were put forward by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are accurate and can be defended, was that taken into account in both the context and his terms, this taking into account, when you made the determination that his speech was nonparliamentary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not going to provide an advisory opinion.

Mr. BIGGS. I am not asking for an advisory opinion. I am asking what you took into account with the Parliamentarian to determine that his words were nonparliamentary. That is what I am asking. And I have given you context and relationship of previous actions, and I have asked for specifically how you limited the speech and debate

clause here, and whether the fact that he has documentation to prove his assertions or not or whether they are relevant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair relied on section 370 of the House Rules and Manual as stated in the ruling.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of passage of H.R. 5665, and commend its sponsor, Representative OMAR, and my colleague from Illinois, Representative SCHAKOWSKY, for its introduction.

I was taught early in life to accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, and don't mess around with Mister-In-Between.

This resolution reaffirms many of the principles in practice that we have been taught and learned that religion is sacrosanct, that religion is sacred, and every person deserves to have their religious thoughts, ideas, and ideology protected.

I urge support and passage of this legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, (Mr. BURCHETT), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I oppose this bill, Madam Speaker, because it is redundant and will grow a State Department bureaucracy that is already overgrown. This is the same State Department that already has two bureaus tasked with this issue.

I wish someone would tell me what exactly it is these bureaucrats are doing now, since they now need a third department to help them do their job.

These are the same State Department bureaucrats who spent 4 years undermining the foreign policy of a Republican President from deep within the government. Now they are getting a pass from the Biden administration to be soft on China, soft on Russia, and of course, soft on Iran.

And the Democrats in the House want us to spend even more taxpayer money on this already bloated bureaucracy, Madam Speaker.

For my friends across the aisle, the solution always seems to be throwing more money at a problem.

After 3 years in the House, I am beginning to realize that, for the Democrats in Congress, our tax dollars are nothing more than political duct tape. The problem with duct tape, Madam Speaker, is it does not actually fix anything, contrary to what some people believe. Like growing government and spending more money, duct tape is not a solution.

So here is an idea I wish my friends across the aisle and President Biden would consider: Rather than feeding the beast, let's cut the State Department's budget until the bureaucrats

deep within decide to get back to work for the American people.

Instead of pushing a woke globalist agenda, Secretary of State Blinkin needs to call his workers back to the office, rather than letting them continue to stay home while passports and visa applications go unprocessed for American citizens and visitors.

Let's not waste our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars playing politics. Our government is big enough. We can do without another dadgum bureaucracy at the State Department.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, Islamophobia is a problem across the world, including in my own district, where one of the many mosques that I represent was vandalized last year.

It is a problem in this body, where only four Muslims have ever served, and where the most visible among them, Congresswoman OMAR, has been the subject of horrible anti-Muslim attacks.

And it is obviously a problem abroad, even rising to the level of genocide in Burma and China.

I am a Jewish Member of Congress who considers fighting all forms of oppression and all instances of religious discrimination core to my faith.

Mr. Speaker, let's all come together and reaffirm that cardinal American value, freedom of religion. Let's pass this law as a step towards protecting the rights of the world's 1.8 million Muslims and an integral part of our work to win freedom and security for all people everywhere.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this legislation. Mr. Speaker, Islamophobia is wrong, just as anti-Semitism, anti-Christian hatred, and all forms of discrimination based on race or religion are wrong.

But this bill, despite whatever the author and defenders of this legislation claim as its purpose or their intent, is not targeted to counter actual Islamophobia.

In fact, this bill is so poorly drafted, any objective analysis of it raises serious concerns about what the true intentions of the bill are because it specifically does not define Islamophobia.

This lack of definition not only risks confusing U.S. foreign policy, but it also would compromise U.S. counterterrorism efforts and undermine our national security.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, and what this bill fails to provide is moral clarity. We don't need nuance or political correctness or silencing debate or censorship on the issue of radical Islamic

terrorism. What we need is intellectual and moral clarity.

□ 2000

Before 9/11, radical Islamic terrorists were at war with the United States. That was before 9/11. Since then, radical Islamic terrorists have been at war with the United States.

Now, you may wish that wasn't the case, but it is a historical fact. If you cannot even acknowledge who the enemy is or that we are at war with them, then how can you expect to defeat that enemy?

We must face the truth, the truth that there is a very real struggle within the Islamic world between religious tolerance, the purported goal of this bill, and an evil, toxic intolerance, the potential byproduct of this bill that says if you are a Christian or if you are a Jew or if you are a moderate Muslim, then you must be destroyed.

This bill, either unintentionally or by design, gives voice to this toxic religious intolerance by failing to exclude from the definition of Islamophobia any policy or viewpoint that rejects radical Islamic terrorism.

This ideology of evil and extreme religious intolerance must be confronted with clarity, as much as each individual act of terrorism. And an over-inclusive definition of Islamophobia threatens to encourage the very extremism that we all say we oppose.

Is it Islamophobia to criticize the Taliban, a self-proclaimed Islamic organization, when they commit grave human rights abuses and oppress women?

Is it Islamophobia to criticize rejoining the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action when talking about the malign, theocratic Islamic Republic of Iran, the leaders of which chant, "Death to America," and promise the destruction of the State of Israel?

Is it Islamophobia to condemn Hamas when they are firing rockets on innocent Israelis from Gaza?

Is it Islamophobia to criticize someone who dismissively, derisively, and defensively refers to 9/11 hijackers as "people who did some things"?

These actions are not Islamophobic. These are beliefs motivated out of security and fact. However, we are voting shortly on a bill that actually does combat Islamophobia, a real Islamophobia, a bipartisan bill to combat the forced labor of Uyghur people and the systemic genocide of peaceful Muslim minorities by the Chinese Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, that bill makes a clear, defined difference. This bill does not. Simply saying we are against Islamophobia without clearly and correctly defining it and establishing an office within the State Department to combat it without safeguards against the relativist views of the politically correct is an invitation to weaponize our foreign policy against itself. We must deal with this problem as it is, not as we would hope it to be.

History teaches us that when Islamic extremists and jihadists are not fought, they grow. Their movement metastasizes. The longer they are not confronted, the more they become emboldened. The more they are appeased and tolerated, the more they overrun territories in the areas they occupy and secure safe havens from which they can launch attacks against the United States and the West.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was more than disappointed that my Democratic colleagues, many of whom I respect very, very much, rejected a good faith amendment in our markup to clearly define what Islamophobia actually is.

We do have a Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism who works off an internationally adopted definition of anti-Semitism. But the way this bill is structured fails to acknowledge that a policy of countering jihad is not, never has been, and never will be Islamophobia. And the bill establishes an office that would actually undermine the very mission of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism.

In sum, this bill, without definitional restraint, will invite anti-Semitism and anti-Christian bias into State Department decisionmaking, and it will do so under the guise of combating Islamophobia. That is what this bill will do without definition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BARR. Maybe this bill is well-intentioned, but if we don't agree to some kind of definition, if we do not provide some clarity—moral clarity, intellectual clarity—as to who the enemy is versus what Islamophobia is, then what we have here in this bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. Nuance and political correctness will not help us defeat our enemy, and it leaves peaceful practitioners of Islam robbed of the definition that they truly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we are not here to talk about criticism. We are here to talk about persecution. We are here to talk about anti-Muslim hate. We are even here to talk about genocide. And we should know it when we see it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5665, the Combating International Islamophobia Act. I thank my friend, Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR, for her leadership on this issue, and also Chairman MEEKS and the Speaker for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill creates mechanisms for the State Department to monitor and combat international

Islamophobia. There are approximately 1.8 billion Muslims in the world, including 3.5 million Muslims in the United States.

Now, the truth is, while Islamophobia is not a new phenomenon, anti-Muslim violence has increased significantly over the past 20 years. Just ask any Muslim what Islamophobia is.

We have seen incidents such as the terrorist attacks on mosques in New Zealand, atrocities against the Uyghurs in China, and Islamophobic laws in France that prevent girls from wearing the hijab in public.

The United Nations Human Rights Council now says that discrimination and hatred toward Muslims have risen to epidemic portions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, whether in the Halls of Congress, our districts, or across the world, we will not tolerate Islamophobia. We know what it is. We must work together to end this bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 5665.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5665. Bringing this bill to the floor is nothing more than empty theatrics from Democrats.

Our Nation has delivered more freedom, opportunity, and liberty to more people around the world than any nation in our history. We have served as the arsenal of democracy and a liberator of oppressed people because we are a good and just nation founded on fundamental, God-given liberties. Included among those, as part of our very first amendment, is the freedom of speech.

Our Nation has lost precious treasure of our fellow countrymen to free people from the horrors of Islamic fundamentalism. We need only look at what has happened to women in Afghanistan since Biden’s disastrous and botched departure. Women are being stoned to death in the street for having the gall to be educated. Women are forced into marriages with blood-thirsty Taliban savages to serve as breeders of the next jihad.

The fight against these kinds of atrocities deserves plainspoken and hard truths to be told. Instead, the other side would like to sterilize free speech and determine what words are allowed under their Orwellian tyranny.

Our Nation and the world deserve so much better than this ridiculous attempt to stifle free speech. There is tremendous evil in this world. Every day that evil is trying to infiltrate and undermine our exceptional Nation.

I will never shy away from calling out evil ideologies, and I will never back down from speaking against them

and how they are used to oppress women, children, and the vulnerable. We must stay committed to opposing heinous acts of violence directed at any religious group around the world, but the fact is, the State Department is already doing this.

This bill brought to the floor today is for one purpose only: to appease the hurt feelings of Members who themselves have well-documented backgrounds of anti-American and anti-Semitic remarks.

I rise against this bill just as I will rise against any attempts to weaken our rights, diminish our liberties, and distract this body from dealing with real issues to strengthen our Nation and empower our people.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Combating International Islamophobia Act.

This legislation creates an office to monitor and combat Islamophobia at the Department of State. In recent years, we have seen tragedies like the 2019 Christchurch shooting, as well as the state-sponsored persecution of Uyghurs in China.

My hometown of Dearborn, Michigan, has a very large Muslim community, and it is also a constant target of Islamophobic hate. There have been thousands of documented complaints of anti-Muslim hate and bias in the United States this year alone. In my community are good-standing Americans. They are afraid and fearful of these actions, and I have heard from constituents who are afraid of visiting their mosques or going to events as a result.

Passing this bill sends a strong message about our shared commitment to safeguarding religious liberty worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Representative from the great State of Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise as a Christian to say *as-salamu alaykum*, which means peace be upon you.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5665 addresses the age-old question: Am I my brother’s and, I might add, sister’s keeper?

If the answer is yes, then what do we do about it when our brothers and our sisters are being victimized by Islamophobia—threatened, murdered, killed?

Mr. Speaker, you can’t be your brothers’ or sisters’ keeper without keeping your brothers and your sisters.

H.R. 5665 addresses this by establishing an office to monitor and combat Islamophobia in the Department of State. H.R. 5665 does something such that we can be our brothers’ and our sisters’ keepers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of it, and I close with Allah hafiz. May God protect you.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of the Combating International Islamophobia Act.

A recent report in California found that 56 percent of the students in California feel unsafe in their school because of their Muslim religious identity. That is not the America I know. Our Nation stands for many freedoms, including the freedom of religion.

I am a proud sponsor of this legislation to create a special envoy to fight anti-Muslim hate crimes in the U.S. and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5665, Combating International Islamophobia Act.

I have listened to my friends on the other side of the aisle, and they are my friends. I hope that we will have the opportunity to work together for what the values of America stand for.

I have heard my colleagues recount the various efforts of inhumane treatment of Muslims around the world. This is an important statement made by America, to create the position of special envoy for monitoring and combating Islamophobia that will be responsible for tracking and coordinating efforts to combat Islamophobia. Also, it would require the State Department’s annual “Country Reports on Human Rights Practices” to include acts of Islamophobia.

□ 2015

With 1 billion Muslims, the reason why I support this legislation is the statement it makes to the world about the values of this country, and the values of this country should be grounded in the fact that the religious freedom of all should be respected.

Then, finally, I am really overwhelmed by the constant battering of our colleague, ILHAN OMAR. To make her the center point of opposition in this place is beneath the dignity of this House. So by passing this legislation, let the world know that America’s values are valuing religious freedom and that we stand against the abuse of Muslims around the world as well as here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I ask my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support H.R. 5665.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5665, the Combating International Islamophobia Act,

which will address the increasing number of incidents of Islamophobia around the world.

Specifically, this bill will:

Create the position of Special Envoy for Monitoring and Combating Islamophobia, who will be responsible for tracking and coordinating efforts to combat Islamophobia abroad; and

Require that the State Department's annual country reports on human rights practices and annual Report on International Religious Freedom include, wherever possible, assessments of the nature and extent of acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement that occur abroad.

As Islamophobia rises globally, it is vital that the State Department have senior personnel in place charged with understanding, reporting on, and combating this scourge worldwide.

In recent decades, we have seen a staggering rise in incidents of violent Islamophobia worldwide.

Whether it is the atrocities being committed against the Uyghurs in China and the Rohingya in Burma, the brutal crackdowns on Muslim populations in India and Sri Lanka, the scapegoating of Muslim refugees and other Muslims in Hungary and Poland, the acts of white supremacist violence targeting Muslims in New Zealand and Canada, or the targeting of minority Muslim communities in Muslim-majority countries like Pakistan, Bahrain, and Iran, it is time for us as policymakers to understand these problems as interconnected and genuinely global.

A staggering number of people have experienced anti-Muslim hate in their lifetime; a number that has only inflated since 9/11.

America is home to one of the most diverse Muslim populations in the world, including people of almost every ethnicity, country, and school of thought.

Approximately one third of the community is African American, one third is of South Asian descent, one quarter is of Arab descent, and the rest are from all over the world, including a growing Latino Muslim population.

While exact numbers are difficult to establish, there are between 3–6 million American Muslims. About one half of this population was born in the U.S., a percentage that continues to grow as immigration slows and younger individuals start having families.

American Muslims are present in all walks of life, as doctors and taxi drivers; lawyers and newspaper vendors; and accountants, homemakers, academics, media personalities, athletes, and entertainers.

Although American Muslims make up approximately one percent of the U.S. population, most Americans can name several famous American Muslims. Names like Muhammad Ali, Malcolm X, Mos Def, Fareed Zakaria, Shaquille O'Neal, Lupe Fiasco, Dr. Oz, and Rima Fakhri are part of our popular consciousness.

Important business figures like Farooq Kathwari (CEO of Ethan Allen), Malik M. Hasan (a pioneer in the field of HMOs), and Safi Qureshey (a leader in PC component manufacturing) are all American Muslims.

Many American Muslims are also civically engaged, working with their neighbors to better their communities. Well-known American Muslim leaders include Rep. Keith Ellison (D-L-Minn.), the first American Muslim to be elected to the U.S. Congress; Rep. ANDRÉ CARSON (D-Ind.); Mohammed Hameeduddin

(Mayor, Teaneck, N.J.); and Amer Ahmad (Comptroller, Chicago).

Nevertheless, levels of Islamophobia are so high that the United Nations Human Rights Council has declared it an issue of "epidemic proportions."

Atrocities have been occurring across the globe, from hate-messages spray-painted on buildings in America to the violent genocide of the Uyghurs in China.

The United States State Department estimated that up to 2 million members of Muslim minorities have experienced a system of detention centers in Xinjiang, known political indoctrination, forced labor, torture, and sexual abuse.

The US, UK, and Canada have accused China of committing genocide and crimes against humanity against Muslim populations at Xinjiang.

In 2018, UN investigators accused the Myanmar's military of carrying out mass killings of Muslim populations with "genocidal intent."

There are reports of attacks on mosques in India and Iran, a history of anti-Muslim sentiments and attacks in Sri Lanka, police targeting against Shia Muslims in Pakistan, massacres of Muslim people in New Zealand, and Islamophobic hate-speech in Canada.

This global injustice must be addressed and rectified and the United States must step up to spearhead the movement.

We need to establish a comprehensive plan for combating Islamophobia not only to ensure the religious freedom and human rights of Muslims, but to protect against a threat to international religious freedom and democratic principles.

The Combating International Islamophobia Act will require the State Department to create a Special Envoy for monitoring and combating Islamophobia answering the call of the American Muslim community for the past two decades.

The envoy will work with domestic and international nongovernmental organizations and institutions to carry out its directives.

The special envoy will give reports on acts of physical violence or harassment against Muslim people as well as acts of vandalism of Muslim community institutions like schools, mosques, and cemeteries.

Regarding anti-Muslim government actions, the envoy will monitor instances of propaganda in media that attempt to justify or promote racial hatred or incite acts of violence against Muslim people.

With the new wealth of information this envoy will bring, policymakers will have a better understanding of the interconnected, global problem of anti-Muslim bigotry.

As part of our commitment to international religious freedom and human rights, we must recognize Islamophobia as a pattern that is repeating in nearly every corner of the globe.

It is past time for the United States to stand firmly in favor of religious freedom for all, and to give the global problem of Islamophobia the attention and prioritization it deserves.

Mr. MCCAUL. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of emotions as I stand before you today.

This bill is a strong step toward combating Islamophobia, but it is only a start. The reality today is that Muslim Americans still face constant abuse right here at home. While it is great to fight Islamophobia abroad, we need to be honest with ourselves about how widespread this disgusting and bigoted anti-Muslim hate is right here in our own country.

Simply put, my two sons and children across our country deserve to grow up in a country where their religion, their faith, will not be used as an excuse to target them and endanger their lives and freedoms.

Muslims across our country deserve Representatives on both sides of the aisle who will embrace them and who will love them for who they are, not those who encourage religious violence for their own political gain.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my fellow Americans who believe in a free, inclusive, and accepting country, know that we will win this fight. The actions of a hateful group of individuals in our country and in this body are out of touch from the vast majority of our Americans and neighbors who are good, decent people who reject this violent White nationalist hate and will put party aside to protect one another from this bigotry.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GREGORY MEEKS, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor which addresses an issue of faith, of values, and of our country.

The House comes together, hopefully, in a spirit of unity—I would have hoped—and patriotism to condemn and combat Islamophobia and all forms of racism, prejudice, and discrimination.

Listening to the debate, I heard Mr. DANNY DAVIS earlier as he was singing "don't mess with Mister In-Between" talking about religion and talking about how it should be off-limits and people's religion should be respected. I know—and probably it is true of everyone here—the respect we have for our own faith and our own religion enables us to appreciate the faith and respect people have for their faith. That is why this is so sad because it is an attack on the faith of one of our Members.

Sadly, but clearly, Islamophobia is a sinister, growing, and for too many American Muslims, a constant presence in our Nation.

To just review some of the figures: Nearly 70 percent of American Muslims have personally experienced anti-Muslim discrimination since September 11.

Thousands of documented acts of anti-Muslim bigotry and violence are recorded each year, with many thousands unreported.

Attacks are growing more common and more brazen—from vandalism of

mosques, to physical assaults on women wearing hijabs, to hate speech from public officials, to bullying and violence of children at schools. Think of how the children hear this.

As we all know, this bigotry has targeted one of our own—shamefully, from within this congressional community. Racism and bigotry of any form, including Islamophobia, must always be called out and condemned in any place it is found. This is particularly true in the Halls of Congress which are the very heart of our democracy and where we have a responsibility under the rules of the House to behave in a way that brings dignity to this body.

Our first President, George Washington—there he is looking over us—over 230 years ago in a letter to the Hebrew Congregation in Newport wrote: “For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.” He, himself, was defining what is the right way to live. Indeed, bigotry and persecution have always been un-American as demonstrated by our patriarch, George Washington.

Anti-Muslim bigotry affects not only Members but many other members of our congressional community. As hundreds of Muslim staffers wrote in a letter last week, Mr. Speaker, they said “hateful rhetoric by public officials directly impacts us and puts our safety at risk, both at the workplace and in our everyday lives.”

The Muslim staffers whom we value here further said: “We must now come to work every day knowing that the same Members and staff who perpetuate Islamophobic tropes and insinuate that we are terrorists also walk by us in the Halls of Congress.”

It is really frightening.

Disturbingly, Islamophobia is not a unique American experience but a global scourge. Earlier this year, the U.N. Human Rights Council declared that discrimination against Muslims has risen to epidemic proportions. Around the world, we see tragedy and tragic consequences of anti-Muslim attitudes: the genocide against the Uyghur people and other Muslim minorities in China, atrocities committed against the Rohingya in Burma, attacks on Muslim refugees in central Europe and white supremacist violence against Muslims in New Zealand and Canada, the targeting of Muslim minority communities in western Asia and the Middle East.

We must confront Islamophobia or any form of racism wherever it is found—around the world, in our country, or even in these very Halls.

This legislation will not only address the rise in incidents of Islamophobia worldwide but launch a plan to combat this bigotry.

I thank Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY and Congresswoman ILHAN

OMAR for their leadership in advancing equity, justice, and dignity in our Congress, in America, and in the world with this action. I thank also the Foreign Affairs Committee chairman, GREGORY MEEKS, for his support of this important action.

With this bill’s passage, Mr. Speaker, a special envoy for monitoring and combating Islamophobia will be created, just as the State Department has special envoys on anti-Semitism and international religious freedom. That is something we have always shared in this body, across the aisle and across the Capitol in a bipartisan way, support for and respect for religious freedom at home and internationally.

This special envoy created here will be charged with establishing a comprehensive strategy to combat Islamophobia worldwide. The State Department’s annual human rights reports will be expanded to include state sponsors of Islamophobic violence and impunity.

As a nation that prides itself on the defense of human rights and dignity, we must be leaders both on the global stage and at home by example to combat violence against Muslims.

Again, Islamophobia in any place is offensive, dangerous, and must be condemned; and Islamophobia in our own congressional community—specifically, the repeated, ongoing, and targeted Islamophobic comments and actions against another Member as we witnessed this past year—is appalling and totally unacceptable.

That language and behavior are far beneath the dignity, integrity, and decency with which the Constitution and our constituents require that we act in this House. These actions must be called out and not tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, every day that we are in session we begin with a prayer because we believe in our own way. Some don’t believe, but by and large, most people here believe. We do so with reverence for our own religious beliefs and with respect for the beliefs of others. If we didn’t have such strong beliefs in ourselves and our own religion, it would be okay and easy to believe that somebody might be frivolous about respecting someone else’s devotion. But we do. We all profess to be people of faith.

The House will continue to look into an array of options to address this priority and to take real action to combat Islamophobia as we have many times taken action to condemn anti-Semitism and other forms of bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman again for his leadership and Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, who was very much a part of this, and Congresswoman OMAR; and I urge a strong, bipartisan vote on this important legislation.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York is prepared to close, I am ready to close.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just first say that all of us deplore anti-Muslim persecution. We are seeing a lot of that in Afghanistan today, especially the small children. We deplore violence on violence, Sunni against Shia. No one should ever be attacked or denied their human rights or dignity because of their faith. I believe both sides of the aisle agree on this, and I personally agree with the intent and the spirit of this bill.

The United States Government is rightly committed to opposing these acts of violence that we have seen directed at Muslims around the world. The State Department has an office to do so.

What I do object to, Mr. Speaker, is the unfortunate circumstance that the bill before us abandons the usual statutory language about violations of internationally recognized human rights. Instead, it uses this vague term, Islamophobia. Look it up on Wikipedia. It says it can mean many things.

This Islamophobia is not defined. It is not that we are against the anti-Muslim persecution or against international human rights violations against Muslims, but rather this Islamophobia.

In connection with that, I would like to quote a 2016 article from Columbia Law Review that states: “There is no singular, cogent, or consensus definition of Islamophobia.”

Similarly, the University of Oslo’s Center for Research on Extremism calls Islamophobia a “contested term.”

These are law review articles, not mine.

It goes on further to say: “The term conflates opposition to Islam with prejudice toward Muslims.”

These expert descriptions underscore the need for due diligence that this text has not yet received. I wish the minority had been given an opportunity to discuss this bill before it was thrown in on the markup, for we all oppose religious persecution against Muslims or any other faith. I am a Catholic. Any other believers in any faith should be protected from this hate speech and violence.

So for those reasons, because the definition is not provided, Islamophobia is a very broad term that can be subject to many interpretations.

If we don’t define that in the Congress through legislative intent, who will?

That means we cede our authority over to the executive branch, and then they write what Islamophobia means. I wish we had used different terms, terminologies that are in statute under law rather than something that is sort of borne on a Wikipedia page.

□ 2030

To me, that is not the way we legislate here. I have done a lot of great legislation with the chairman and the previous chairman of this committee, and I intend to keep doing that with him. I

appreciate our joint efforts to advance strong, responsible bipartisan legislation to protect religious freedom.

We are going to have one of those bills coming up right after this one on the Uyghur Muslims, and I appreciate that. I know this has been a heated debate, and some things have been said today that could be offensive. This is not about one Member of Congress. This is about our ability to come together as Americans and come out with a strong bipartisan bill that makes sense so we can send the message around the world that this will not be tolerated, just as we are standing up for the Uyghur Muslims with the genocide bill and the bill that is going to follow this debate here today.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a rigorous debate, and we expected this. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. McCAUL for his statements. Yes, we work very closely together, as well as many Members in this House, especially on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, strong fighters on both sides of the aisle for human rights.

The question that presents itself with this plain and simple bill that simply calls for us to establish an office to monitor and combat Islamophobia at the State Department is: Do we all agree? I think I have heard my colleagues on the other side say that Islamophobia is wrong. That means you know that Islamophobia exists.

You know it when you see it. You know it when you feel it. You know it when you talk about the Uyghurs, the Rohingyas, or right here in the United States of America. There is a definition right there. You see it. They have said it. We have said it. Islamophobia exists.

What we need to do is call it out. What we need to do is lock arms and stand together. This is an important bill. The camera of history is rolling on us. It is an important bill, and it is a bill of consequence. It should be of consequence to every human being on the planet, no matter your religion or no matter your race.

It is important to nearly 2 billion Muslims in the world. We need to focus on what this bill does. Some of the proudest moments of mine—I live in and represent one of the most diverse districts in all the United States, in the most diverse county in the United States. I have seen ugliness raise its ugly head, whether it is racism, anti-Semitism, or Islamophobia.

But the proud moment is when I see Muslims and Jews walking arm-in-arm against Islamophobia and against anti-Semitism, when I see people of all races and nationalities standing together and not being silent.

Inaction is unacceptable. We cannot stand idly by as atrocity after atrocity is inflicted on people of the Muslim faith, or any faith, for no reason other than bigotry against their religion.

Freedom of religion is a human right. We can and must do better at combating Islamophobia here at home and abroad. I wish it was today, but I keep dreams and hopes alive that we will lock arms—we have good people here—and say in unison, as I have seen people do in my district, that we are going to call out Islamophobia wherever we see it, the same with racism and the same with anti-Semitism.

Mr. Speaker, this bill that everybody is watching—we travel a lot on our committee. We know that people watch what is happening on this floor. They take it to their gut. I hope that they look at this bill and know that we are going to call it out and not accept it. Silence will not be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill that sends a clear signal about United States policy with respect to discrimination, especially violent, murderous discrimination against a whole class of people because of their ethnicity and/or religion.

But the significance of this bill is much more profound; it moves us forward in terms of our self-definition as Americans.

Our history is pockmarked with violent discrimination against groups that “got in the way.” Groups that challenged us to improve on the prevailing self-definition at the time.

From Native Americans who were dehumanized, Chinese Americans denied citizenship and naturalization as a group in our immigration laws, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Irish-Catholics discriminated against by Abolitionists.

The intent of this bill goes to our self-definition as a nation, something every generation must revisit.

By enshrining this in our State Department as a priority policy, that will be propounded with other nations, we make ourselves better too. We live up to our ideals as a people.

I hope we rise above the partisan temptations to score points at the expense of a whole class of people, at the expense of people all around the world who we have never met but count on us to do the right thing on their behalf.

This bill is important for those people who can't find their own voice, because they have been denied it, but let's use ours on their behalf. It will save lives and it will improve our own sense of identity, who we are, what it means to be American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 849, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5746. An act to amend title 51, United States Code, to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration.

CAPITOL POLICE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2021

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3377) to empower the Chief of the United States Capitol Police to unilaterally request the assistance of the DC National Guard or Federal law enforcement agencies in emergencies without prior approval of the Capitol Police Board, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Capitol Police Emergency Assistance Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR THE CAPITOL POLICE.

(a) ASSISTANCE BY EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Section 911(a) of division B of the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act, 2002 (2 U.S.C. 1970(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or in accordance with paragraph (4)” before “and on a permanent”;

(2) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “advance”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking “and” after the semicolon and inserting “or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) the Chief of the Capitol Police, if the Chief of the Capitol Police has determined that the provision of assistance is necessary to prevent the significant disruption of governmental function and public order within the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds, as described in section 9 of the Act entitled ‘An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes’, approved July 31, 1946 (2 U.S.C. 1961); and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) REVOCATION.—The Capitol Police Board may revoke a request for assistance provided under paragraph (4)(B)(ii)(III) upon